DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 052 IR 054 292

AUTHOR Larsen, Sandra
TITLE The Acquisition and Accessibility of Monographic Series in Ohio.
PUB DATE Aug 92
NOTE 49p.; Master of Library Science Thesis, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; *Cataloging; Coding; Definitions; *Library Acquisition; *Library Collection Development; *Library Material Selection; *Policy; Public Libraries; Publishing Industry; Serials
IDENTIFIERS Library of Congress; *Monographs; Ohio; Shelving Practices

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this project was to determine if publishers, by numbering a monographic series, facilitate the acquisition or retrieval of individual monographs. Treatment of monographic series has been erratic for several reasons: (1) changing cataloging codes; (b) inconsistency by the Library of Congress in regard to series added entries and analysis; and (3) inconsistency by publishers in numbering and designating series. Because changing cataloging codes have arguably had the greatest impact on the manner in which librarians treat monographic series, the first part of this paper traces the evolution of national cataloging codes and policies directly related to monographic series. The second section discusses the results of a survey of collection development librarians from Ohio academic and public libraries which addressed the topic from the collection development point of view. Librarians at 24 libraries--4 each from small, medium, and large academic libraries and small, medium, and large public libraries--received a mailed survey; 16 responses were received. The results of the survey confirm what the literature on monographic series stresses: there is a lack of agreement by librarians on the definitions of "serial" and "monographic series." It also appears that numbering monographic series does not greatly enhance the possibility that the series will be placed on standing order, but that it does increase the likelihood that the individual monographs will be fully cataloged and more accessible to patrons. Copies of the questionnaire sent to librarians and the cover letter are appended. (Contains 32 references.) (Author/KRN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

IR

ED352052

THE ACQUISITION AND ACCESSIBILITY OF MONOGRAPHIC SERIES IN OHIO

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library and Information Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Sandra Larsen

August, 1992

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sandra C. Larsen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12054292

Master's Research Paper by

Sandra Larsen

B.B.A., Kent State University, 1986

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1992

Approved by

Advisor _____ Date July 12, 92

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Treatment of monographic series has been erratic for several reasons: (a) changing cataloging codes; (b) inconsistency by the Library of Congress in regard to series added entries and analysis; and (c) inconsistency by publishers in numbering and designating series. The purpose of this project was to determine if publishers, by numbering a monographic series, facilitate the individual monographs' acquisition or retrieval. The first part of this paper traces the evolution of national cataloging codes and policies directly related to monographic series. The second section discusses the results of a survey of collection development librarians from Ohio academic and public libraries which addressed the topic from the collection development point of view. The literature on monographic series stresses the lack of agreement by librarians on the definitions of "serial" and "monographic series." The results of the survey confirm this lack of agreement with these definitions. It also appears that numbering monographic series does not greatly enhance the possibility that the series will be placed on standing order, but that it does increase the likelihood that the individual monographs will be fully cataloged and more accesible to patrons.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction _____ 1

II. The Evolution of Cataloging Codes and Policies as Related to Monographic Series _____ 4

Cataloging Codes _____ 4

Practices _____ 5

III. Collection Development Perspective

Objective of the Study _____ 18

Methodology _____ 18

Findings _____ 19

IV. Conclusion and Recommendations _____ 31

APPENDIX A: Questionnaire Cover Letter
APPENDIX B: Questionnaire

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 _____ Profile of Population

TABLE 2 _____ Summary Results

TABLE 3 _____ Academic Library Results

TABLE 4 _____ Public Library Results

TABLE 5 _____ Large Library Results

TABLE 6 _____ Medium Library Results

TABLE 7 _____ Small Library Results

I. INTRODUCTION

Monographic series are defined as separate items with their own titles which are related to each other through a collective title; the separate items may or may not be numbered. Treatment of monographic series has been erratic for several reasons: (a) changing cataloging codes; (b) inconsistency by the Library of Congress in regard to series added entries and analysis; and (c) inconsistency by publishers in numbering series. In addition to inconsistently numbering series, publishers have also been inconsistent in designating series. Other difficulties caused by publishers include issuing individual monographs in more than one series or set, each with its own numbering system.

Publishers have long been aware of the value of series as a marketing method; their origin can be traced back to the late 17th century in England when individual plays by certain playwrights were issued in numbered pamphlets. By 1985, 37,619 series comprised of 326,688 titles were listed in Books in Series. (1) Many monographic series have excellent, scholarly reputations, such as Scrittori d'Italia, has been published by Bari, G. Laterza for many years. This series also serves as a good example of a numbered monographic series. An example of an unnumbered monographic series is the Library Science Text Series, published by Libraries Unlimited.

The purpose of this project is to determine if, by numbering a monographic series, publishers facilitate the individual monographs' acquisition or accessibility. The project is comprised of two principal parts, the first of which traces the evolution of national cataloging codes and policies which directly impact monographic series. This section is intended to provide a detailed background of the cataloging aspect, as the changing cataloging codes have arguably had the greatest impact on the manner in which libraries treat monographic series. The second section addresses the collection development librarian perspective on how monographic series are treated within their libraries. A sample of collection development librarians from Ohio academic and public libraries have provided their perceptions of their libraries' treatment of monographic series through responses to a mailed questionnaire.

Definitions of "monographic series" and "serial" abound in the literature, partially reflecting the erratic treatment of monographic series, and serials in general, in U.S. libraries. The 1943 A.L.A. Glossary of Library Terms definition included limitations on the publisher and scope: "A series of monographic works issued in uniform style under a collective title by an academy, an association, a learned society, or an institution. The monographs...are usually related in subject or interest." (2) The 1967 Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) definition did not limit the publisher or scope: "A number of separate works

issued in succession and related to one another by the fact that each bears a collective title generally appearing at the head of the title page, on the half title, or on the cover, normally issued by the same publisher in a uniform style, frequently in a numerical sequence." (3)

The current standard definition in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules 2 (AACR2) contains none of the above limitations: "A group of separate items related to one another by the fact that each item bears, in addition to its own title proper, a collective title applying to the group as a whole. The individual items may or may not be numbered." AACR2 also clearly identifies monographic series as serial publications in its definition of "serial": "A publication in any medium issued in successive parts bearing numeric or chronological designations and intended to be continued indefinitely. Serials include periodicals; newspapers; annuals;...and numbered monographic series." (4)

Though all of these definitions have been advanced by the American Library Association, none of them have been widely accepted as suitable working definitions. Doris Clack wrote in 1990, "There are no standard criteria for defining series nor are there national standards for organizing them. The works that some people consider a series, others may consider a set or even a serial. Still, others may consider them distinct, separate monographs." (5)

II. THE EVOLUTION OF CATALOGING CODES AND POLICIES AS RELATED TO MONOGRAPHIC SERIES

Cataloging Codes

Pre-AACR

The evolution of cataloging codes has had a major impact on monographic series. Past cataloging codes have had a lasting effect because most catalogs still contain series headings which were constructed in accordance with these various codes. According to Mary Wilson, another of the problems associated with these former codes is that they "mixed issues of description and access;...decisions as to which access points were to be made affected decisions as to how the item would be described." (6)

The 1908 Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries instructed librarians to enter the series under its title unless it was well-known by the editor or publisher's name. Instructions on series notes mostly dealt with where the series title actually appeared on the publication. The A.L.A. Catalog Rules, Author and Title Entries, published in 1941, was the next set of rules to be published. (7) These rules did not differ much from the 1908 rules and were basically a preliminary edition of the two sets of rules published in 1949: A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries and Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress. These two codes intermingled series

description and access more than any of the other codes have. One rule in Rules for Descriptive Cataloging required catalogers to determine whether or not a series added entry was to be made before they could choose from two or more forms of description to use. A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries said to enter a series under its title with two exceptions. The first was the same as the 1908 rules concerning a well-known editor or publisher. The second exception instructed the cataloger to "enter a series under the name of a society, institution or other corporate body, a series issued by it without a distinctive title." (8) This phenomenon of corporate entries for series remained part of cataloging codes until AACR2.

Another decision for monographic series catalogers is whether or not to provide an analytical entry for each volume. The 1949 A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries defined this type of entry as: "the entry of some part of a work or of some article contained in a collection (volume of essays, serial, etc.)" (9) This definition refers to providing both serial and monographic cataloging for books in monographic series; the series itself is cataloged as a serial while the individual components are cataloged as monographs with author, title, subject headings, etc.

AACR

The Anglo-American Cataloging Rules in 1967 did not alter the treatment of monographic series from the previous codes; description and access remained intermingled. Description and access were separated somewhat with the work on the International Standard Bibliographic Descriptions (ISBD). The ISBD as presented in Chapter 6 of AACR eliminated a rule requiring catalogers to include the name of the author in the series description before the series title. (10)

In regard to the analysis of monographic series, AACR provided a more specific definition than did the 1949 rules: "An entry for a work or part of a work that is contained in a collection, series, issue of a serial, or other bibliographic unit for which another, comprehensive entry has been made. Analytical entries may be either separate, self-contained entries or added entries that are part of the cataloging of the larger work." (11)

AACR2

AACR2 brought about the near-complete separation of monographic series description and access because it required treating serials like monographs as much as possible. For the title through the series areas of the cataloging record, catalogers were no longer required to base descriptions on access decisions. Subsequent interpretations of AACR2 by the Library of Congress have strengthened this rule by treating increasing numbers of

materials as monographs rather than as serials. Intermingled description and access can still be a problem, however, particularly with some automated systems with linked authority control. One such complication occurs on systems in which the series title is stored only in the authority file and not in the bibliographic record itself. To construct the bibliographic record for display to the patron, the system takes the series title directly from the authority file, which usually results in the display of a version of the title that is not on the publication itself. (12)

AACR2's definition of analysis of series is much simpler than that found in AACR: "An entry for a part of an item for which a comprehensive entry has been made." (13) As definitions for these terms have broadened with each successive code, libraries have needed more specific guidelines from other sources to apply the codes correctly.

Practices

Library of Congress

Each one of the aforementioned cataloging codes has affected the cataloging practices of nearly every library in the United States. As the largest and "semi-official" national library in the U.S., the Library of Congress' interpretations of the codes and its cataloging practices have also greatly impacted the cataloging of most U.S. libraries.

One of the earliest official communications by the Library of Congress in regard to monographic series came in 1952. This was in the form of a memorandum and contained the criteria used to decide whether or not to catalog series as series. The criteria are as follows:

a. if an order of arrangement of the monographs in the series is indicated by the volumes in hand;

b. if the Library is likely to receive the issues of the series regularly;

c. If the monographs are closely related in subject or content;

d. if the monographs are slight in format and would therefore best be kept together;

e. if the issues are consecutively paged.

The memo continued with criteria to be considered when deciding whether to analyze a series:

a. if the monographic series are of individual importance because of their authors, sponsoring bodies, subject interest, or for other reasons;

b. if the monographs have separate authors;

c. if the staff is qualified linguistically or by subject knowledge to undertake the task.

According to the Cataloging Service Bulletin issued in May 1972, the Library of Congress was "analyzing all analyzable series, except documents, technical reports, reprints from journals, and those requiring page analytics." (14) The Library of Congress publishes its interpretations of AACR2 in the Cataloging Service Bulletin (CSB). In CSB 53, (Summer 1991), "sources of information as the basis for accepting or rejecting an item as a series" were listed:

a. Embedded in text
   1. Preliminaries/colophon
   2. Prefatory matter or text proper
b. Jacket
c. Bibliography
d. On label or stamped on the item
e. Publisher's listing
f. Lecture series
g. Cataloging data printed in the book
h. CIP data sheet at the sheet/galley stage
i. Selected issues of a periodical published also in hardcover editions
j. Series combined with the monograph title (15)

This list's variations since 1952 have been a part of the Library of Congress' inconsistency in handling monographic series.

The Library of Congress was affected by the changes in cataloging rules for monographic series by AACR2 just as were other libraries. In May 1981, the Library began to provide guidance to other libraries by announcing its guidelines and interpretations of AACR2. One of the main problems for catalogers brought about by the changes in AACR2 was the lack of direction it provided in determining whether to treat publications as serial or monograph. Rule 12.0A., Scope, states: "The rules in this chapter cover the description of serial publications of all kinds and in all media." (16) The Library of Congress Rule Interpretation (LCRI) for 12.0A found in Cataloging Service Bulletin (CSB) no. 20 (Spring 1983) offered guidance to catalogers by listing specific tests to use in order to determine if a publication was serial or not. This LCRI was modified and reissued in CSB no. 29 (Summer 1985). Both CSB nos. 20 and 29 state their intent to help in applying AACR2's glossary definition of "serial," "particularly

when questions arise as to the publisher's intention." (17)

LCRI 12.0A(1)(a-e) lists five types of publications which should be initially treated as serials "even though it does not carry a statement of intent" as long as it has a numeric or chronological designation. Catalogers were encouraged to initially treat the following as serial: items with titles like "Advances in..."; items which include a statement of frequency in the title; U.S. and European college catalogs; court reports (nonloose-leaf variety); session laws; items which could be placed on standing order with the publisher (except for conference, exhibition and loose-leaf publications); and items bearing an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN), unless they were conference, exhibition or loose-leaf publications. (18)

CSB nos. 32 (Spring 1986) and 44 (Spring 1989) both contained further modifications of rule 12.0 interpretations. The overall trend with these interpretations appears to be toward tighter restrictions of the types of publications defined - and therefore treated - as serial.

The Library of Congress has also issued LCRIs on rules 1.6 (Series area) and 21.30L (Series Added Entry). The first LCRI issued on rule 1.6 appeared in CSB no. 11 (Winter 1981) and discussed using the main series ISSN in the series area of the bibliographic record when the subseries ISSN is unknown.

Subsequent CSBs have addressed the following: title proper of series, sources of information, parallel titles of series, subseries, and more than one series statement. One of the most lengthy LCRIs issued on series was CSB no. 31 (Winter 1986), which dealt with numbering within series. (19) At this point in time, the Library of Congress has issued LCRIs on nearly every rule which applies to monographic series.

III. COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT PERSPECTIVE

Relative to the quantity of literature written about serials, monographic series have received very little coverage. Monographic series are almost never treated in the literature from a collection development or acquisitions point of view beyond noting that placing series on standing order allows for a more consistent, automatic acquisitions process.

The Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science is one source which does address the topic of monographic series thoroughly. It lists seven common characteristics of series, one of which is that series are usually numbered. The same article later points out that "numbered series are far from universal, however," and that in their cataloging, numbered series are more likely to have series added entries than are unnumbered series. This tendency serves to make unnumbered series more difficult to retrieve

because they generally have fewer access points on their bibliographic records. (20)

Adrian Peasgood's chapter in the Library Association's book Serials Librarianship discusses the results of a 1978 survey of university and college librarians. Librarians expressed their concerns about the best relationship between book acquisitions and serial acquisitions departments, particularly in regard to responsibility for handling monographic series. The survey revealed that two-thirds of the respondent libraries had no working definitions of "serial" or "periodical", which could have been a major factor in their disagreement as to which department should handle monographic series. Peasgood also noted that the literature is replete with attempts to define these terms, none of which had as yet gained widespread acceptance. (21)

Most of the literature agrees with Peasgood's statement concerning the multitude of definitions for serials, periodicals, and series. Andrew Osborn, in his book Serial Publications, devotes seventeen pages of the first chapter to defining "serial". (22) The manner in which a library defines serials dictates how that library will handle those materials; for example, some libraries treat numbered, monographic series as nonserials, resulting in fewer access points on their bibliographic records because the series are not traced. (23)

The authors of Acquisitions Management and Collection Development in Libraries, Rose Mary Magrill and John Corbin, feel that the definitions of "serial" and "monographic series" found in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules 2 are generally accepted by the profession, but that interpretations may vary somewhat depending on the type of library. (24)

Librarians are not alone in their need to successfully identify monographic series. Dana Alessi and Kathleen Goforth present an approval vendor's point of view in their article "Standing Orders and Approval Plans: Are They Compatible?" Blackwell North America's main concern when instituting approval programs is to avoid duplicating a library's standing orders. This vendor's process is very labor intensive; all books in series are reviewed by general editors and series specialists. Unnumbered monographic series are almost always sent as separate monographs on approval plans and not as part of series because standing orders are rarely placed for them. (25)

Most of the literature which emphasizes monographic series is written about the cataloging of series. Whether or not, or how, monographic series should be analyzed and whether they should be classified as sets by the overall series subject or as individual monographs by specific subject are the main thrust of these studies. Rothman and Ditzion documented the various treatments of serials by libraries in an article in 1940. "With the

increase of the publication of new and diverse types of serials, there has come into being an obvious consciousness of the fact that serial publications are different from books. As a result, we find many distinctions in the treatment of periodicals, serials, continuations, and serial publications." (26)

A survey by the Colorado Library Association of its member libraries in the early 1980s also pointed out the different treatment of serials by various libraries. The survey was an attempt to ascertain cataloging practices of libraries using automated systems. Many of the respondent libraries reported relying heavily on Library of Congress bibliographic and authority records. Differing treatment of serial and series records surfaced in local original record input. Fewer than half of the respondent libraries updgraded existing nonserial uniform titles and series to AACR2; slightly over half provided nonserial uniform titles and series in accordance with AACR2; and many did not utilize either series or nonserial uniform titles in their bibliographic databases. (27)

Margaret Mann, as reported by Ruth McBride, stated in 1943 that the cataloger should take into consideration the type and size of library when making decisions about the number of analytical entries to make. Another criterion many libraries have used to decide whether or not to analyze a series is the existence of indexing for the material. Other libraries have formed

committees of the heads of cataloging and reference and/or a subject specialist to look at every new series and determine how it should be treated. (28)

One article which explores the consequences of these cataloging decisions from the user's point of view is "Analysis of Monographic Series" by Ruth McBride. McBride cites her study with Stenstrom of serial use by social science faculty. The authors found that members of this group generally go to the library with a citation to a specific article. A study by Hyman concluded that many academic and research library patrons browse for materials. Librarians need to know how patrons search so that cataloging policies can be established which ensure that patrons can easily access materials. Patrons who come to the library with citations need complete bibliographic records; patrons who browse for materials need to have similar materials classified together. Pauline Cochrane has suggested that any use studies done with traditional card catalogs are probably not valid when applied to online catalogs. (29)

Libraries now not only have to be concerned with working with former and current internal policies and various national cataloging rules, but also the degree of automation attained, the MARC format, and standards and limitations imposed by the bibliographic networks to which they belong.

There are potential problems in online catalogs other than those caused by linked authority control, as previously mentioned. Another example is the difficulties associated with monographic series from pre-AACR2 codes, such as the intermingling of series description and access. Many libraries' catalogs contain examples of the same series title entered in several different ways because of adherence to the various cataloging rules. These intermingled entry formats can make series authority work even more challenging in some automated systems than it was in manual systems. (30)

The manner in which a library treats monographic series affects not only the cataloging department, but also the acquisitions and reference departments. As more monographic series are ordered and cataloged as serials, the more complicated check-in procedures for these items becomes. The flexibility of the library's automation system largely determines how the library will handle monographic series online - whatever control the automated system cannot provide for check-in of materials needs to be handled by a manual system. The difficulty caused for public services in an online environment is the time involved in the two processing steps - cataloging and check-in - required for series; patrons can see on an item's bibliographic record that it is in the library but is not yet accessible. (31)

Automation has not only affected individual libraries but the

manner in which libraries interact with one another. As libraries automate, they begin to make use of bibliographic networks. Utilizing bibliographic networks has changed the way many libraries catalog monographic series. At one library, many series are cataloged as separates rather than as analytics simply because it is felt that OCLC makes it easy and relatively inexpensive to do so. (32)

Bibliographic and inputting standards are essential to the success of these networks' shared databases. Susan Matson outlined some of the necessary considerations for a national series authority file in 1982. The first obstacle to overcome is defining "series" so that all contributors to and users of the file clearly understand what is to be included in the file. Other factors to consider include which information, in addition to the series title, needs to be included in the record; the manner in which series headings should be constructed; and the need to utilize uniform titles. (33)

For these bibliographic networks to be even more effective in the future, many librarians feel that more direction at the national level and strict adherence to cataloging codes are necessary. Because present-day decisions can have such far-reaching effects, long-term planning has also been targeted by many librarians as an essential part of the process.

Objective of the Study

This study was only one step in the process of standardizing the treatment of monographic series. The project's specific purpose was to determine if, by numbering a monographic series, publishers facilitate the individual monographs' acquisition or accessibility.

Methodology

Data for this study was collected through the use of a mailed questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to encourage collection development librarians to address the treatment of monographic series in their libraries. The population of the survey was academic and public libraries in Ohio as reported in the 1991 Statistics of Ohio Libraries. Random sampling was used to identify four libraries in each of the following six categories: large, medium, and small academic, and large, medium, and small public libraries. The size of each institution was determined by the number of volumes held by the library as reported in the 1991 Statistics of Ohio Libraries. (34) Large was defined as 800,000 volumes and above; medium was defined as 150,000 to 799,999 volumes; and small was defined as 0 to 149,999 volumes. See TABLE 1 for a profile of the population including average collection size of the respondents.

TABLE 1

Profile of Population

	Number of Respondents	Average Collection Size
Academic		
Large	1	1,012,884
Medium	4	264,782
Small	3	51,402
Public		
Large	2	1,660,404
Medium	3	236,403
Small	3	36,608

Data were compared within library type and size categories and across categories. All responses were evaluated based on their relation to the study's hypothesis.

Findings

The overall response rate was 67%. The response rate within each type and size category was at least 50% with the exception of large academic libraries at 25%. Respondents included one large academic library, four medium academic libraries, three small academic libraries, two large public libraries, three medium public libraries and three small public libraries. Comparisons have been made across size and type categories. No generalizations about large academic library practices are included as the response rate was too low. See TABLE 2 for a

summary of the results. TABLES 3 through 7 provide breakdowns of responses by library size and type. (TABLES 2 through 7 are located at the end of the "Findings" section.)

Books in both numbered and unnumbered monographic series were searchable by series title in 14 (87%) of the libraries. The remaining 13% consisted of two of the three small academic libraries, one of which commented that there were some exceptions; "apparently we haven't had a consistent policy." None of the libraries' automation systems generated data regarding series title searches. Six respondents (38%) also reported that their libraries were not automated.

Thirteen (81%) of the respondents identified the cataloging department as one of the departments in their libraries which makes decisions about whether to classify monographic series together or separately. One hundred percent of both the large and the medium academic and public library respondents identified the cataloging department. Three of the 7 medium libraries also indicated the collection development department. There was less consistency among the small libraries as only 50% reported the cataloging department. The answers of the 25% of the small library respondents who indicated "other" ranged from "faculty" to "only one part-time librarian employed". In general, it appeared that the larger the library, regardless of type, the more likely the cataloging department was involved in making such

classification decisions.

There appeared to be no significant differences between library types and sizes regarding the percentage of numbered and unnumbered monographic series on standing order at the respondents' libraries; 10 (72%) of the respondents indicated that "0-19%" of numbered monographic series were placed on standing order, and 12 (86%) of the respondents indicated that "0-19%" of unnumbered monographic series were placed on standing order. The large academic library and one small academic library did not respond to either question.

The department which most often places standing orders was nearly evenly divided among collection development (44%, or 7 libraries), acquisitions (38%, or 6 libraries), and "other" (38%, or 6 libraries). Answers provided in the "other" category included "main divisions/branch request", "reference", and "faculty". One small academic library indicated that no standing orders are placed at her library so she could not provide an answer. Responses to question 8, indicating whether or not the respondent checks to see if a monograph in a numbered series is on standing order before initiating an order for it, were evenly divided with 8 "no" and 8 "yes" responses. Noticeable differences did appear between the various categories; however, there was no identifiable trend across library types or sizes.

All respondents indicated that their libraries do not have acquisitions policies specific to monographic series. Thirteen (81%) of the respondents revealed that their libraries do not have cataloging policies specific to monographic series. Respondents who did report policies included 2 of the 3 large libraries and 1 of the medium libraries. The large academic library's policy was to trace monographic series "if they are significant". The policy reported by a medium academic library was to follow Library of Congress practice in cataloging and classifying and "what has been done at this library previously". Also related by a large public library were very specific instructions for entry in a MARC record in the Book Format. This library utilized both fixed and variable fields to accentuate both the serial and monographic aspects of a piece. The larger libraries appeared to be the most likely to have specific policies for monographic series.

Only 5 (31%) of the libraries have specific definitions for "serial" and "monographic series". Respondents who indicated "yes" included 100% of the large and 28%, or 2, of the medium academic library respondents. Definitions ranged from the informal: "Serial series are usually paperbacks or pamphlet-like material which arrive with consistent frequency. They are processed and shelved with the other serials. Monographic series are cataloged. They usually are books and are ordered through a book vendor"; to the standard ALA and AACR2 definitions and

Library of Congress guidelines. Again, it appeared that the larger the library, regardless of type, the more likely that it would utilize specific definitions.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY RESULTS TABLE

1. Are books in numbered monographic series searchable in your library's catalog by series title?

YES	14	87%
NO	2	13%

2. Are books in unnumbered monographic series searchable in your library's catalog by series title?

YES	14	87%
NO	2	13%

3. Does your library's automation system generate data regarding the number of series title searches performed over a specified period of time?

YES	0	0%
NO	16	100%

4. Which department in your library makes decisions about whether to classify monographic series together or separately? (Check all that apply.)

Collection Development	4	25%
Cataloging	13	81%
Acquisitions	0	0%
Other	4	25%

5. What is your impression of the percentage of numbered monographic series that are placed on standing order at your library?

80% - 100%	1	7%
60% - 79%	1	7%
40% - 59%	1	7%
20% - 39%	1	7%
0% - 19%	10	72%

Two respondents gave no estimate.

TABLE 2 (continued)

6. What is your impression of the percentage of <u>unnumbered</u> monographic series that are placed on standing order at your library?

80% - 100%	0	0%
60% - 79%	2	14%
40% - 59%	0	0%
20% - 39%	0	0%
0% - 19%	12	86%

Two respondents gave no estimate.

---

7. Which department most often places standing orders? (Check all that apply.)

Collection Development	7	44%
Cataloging	0	0%
Acquisitions	6	38%
Other	6	38%

---

8. As a collection development librarian, do you generally check to see if a monograph in a numbered series is already on standing order before you initiate an order for it?

YES	8	50%
NO	8	50%

---

9. Does your library have acquisitions policies specific to monographic series?

YES	0	0%
NO	16	100%

---

10. Does your library have cataloging policies specific to monographic series?

YES	3	19%
NO	13	81%

---

11. Does your library use specific definitions for what is a "serial" and "monographic series?"

YES	5	31%
NO	11	69%

TABLE 3

ACADEMIC LIBRARY RESULTS

		LARGE	MEDIUM	SMALL
1.	YES	100%	100%	33%
	NO	0%	0%	67%
2.	YES	100%	100%	33%
	NO	0%	0%	67%
3.	YES	0%	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%	100%
4.	C.D.	0%	25%	0%
	CAT.	100%	100%	33%
	ACQ.	0%	0%	0%
	OTHER	0%	50%	67%
5.	0-19%	0%	50%	67%
	20-39%	0%	0%	0%
	40-59%	0%	25%	0%
	60-79%	0%	0%	0%
	80-100%	0%	25%	0%
6.	0-19%	0%	75%	67%
	20-39%	0%	0%	0%
	40-59%	0%	0%	0%
	60-79%	0%	25%	0%
	80-100%	0%	0%	0%
7.	C.D.	100%	25%	33%
	CAT.	0%	0%	0%
	ACQ.	100%	25%	33%
	OTHER	0%	50%	66%
8.	YES	100%	75%	0%
	NO	0%	25%	67%
9.	YES	0%	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%	100%
10.	YES	100%	25%	0%
	NO	0%	75%	100%
11.	YES	100%	50%	0%
	NO	0%	50%	100%

TABLE 4

PUBLIC LIBRARY RESULTS

		LARGE	MEDIUM	SMALL
1.	YES	100%	100%	100%
	NO	0%	0%	0%
2.	YES	100%	100%	100%
	NO	0%	0%	0%
3.	YES	0%	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%	100%
4.	C.D.	0%	67%	33%
	CAT.	100%	100%	67%
	ACQ.	0%	0%	0%
	OTHER	0%	0%	0%
5.	0-19%	100%	67%	67%
	20-39%	0%	33%	0%
	40-59%	0%	0%	0%
	60-79%	0%	0%	33%
	80-100%	0%	0%	0%
6.	0-19%	100%	100%	67%
	20-39%	0%	0%	0%
	40-59%	0%	0%	0%
	60-79%	0%	0%	33%
	80-100%	0%	0%	0%
7.	C.D.	0%	100%	33%
	CAT.	0%	0%	0%
	ACQ.	50%	33%	33%
	OTHER	100%	0%	0%
8.	YES	0%	33%	67%
	NO	100%	67%	33%
9.	YES	0%	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%	100%
10.	YES	50%	0%	0%
	NO	50%	100%	100%
11.	YES	100%	0%	0%
	NO	0%	100%	100%

TABLE 5

LARGE LIBRARY RESULTS

		ACADEMIC	PUBLIC
1.	YES	100%	100%
	NO	0%	0%
2.	YES	100%	100%
	NO	0%	0%
3.	YES	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%
4.	C.D.	0%	0%
	CAT.	100%	100%
	ACQ.	0%	0%
	OTHER	0%	0%
5.	0-19%	0%	100%
	20-39%	0%	0%
	40-59%	0%	0%
	60-79%	0%	0%
	80-100%	0%	0%
6.	0-19%	0%	100%
	20-39%	0%	0%
	40-59%	0%	0%
	60-79%	0%	0%
	80-100%	0%	0%
7.	C.D.	100%	0%
	CAT.	0%	0%
	ACQ.	100%	50%
	OTHER	0%	50%
8.	YES	100%	0%
	NO	0%	100%
9.	YES	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%
10.	YES	67%	50%
	NO	33%	50%
11.	YES	100%	100%
	NO	0%	0%

TABLE 6

MEDIUM LIBRARY RESULTS

		ACADEMIC	PUBLIC
1.	YES	100%	100%
	NO	0%	0%
2.	YES	100%	100%
	NO	0%	0%
3.	YES	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%
4.	C.D.	25%	67%
	CAT.	100%	100%
	ACQ.	0%	0%
	OTHER	50%	0%
5.	0-19%	50%	67%
	20-39%	0%	33%
	40-59%	25%	0%
	60-79%	0%	0%
	80-100%	25%	0%
6.	0-19%	75%	100%
	20-39%	0%	0%
	40-59%	0%	0%
	60-79%	25%	0%
	80-100%	0%	0%
7.	C.D.	25%	100%
	CAT.	0%	0%
	ACQ.	25%	33%
	OTHER	50%	0%
8.	YES	75%	33%
	NO	25%	67%
9.	YES	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%
10.	YES	25%	0%
	NO	75%	100%
11.	YES	50%	0%
	NO	50%	100%

TABLE 7

SMALL LIBRARY RESULTS

		ACADEMIC	PUBLIC
1.	YES	33%	100%
	NO	67%	0%
2.	YES	33%	100%
	NO	67%	0%
3.	YES	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%
4.	C.D.	0%	33%
	CAT.	33%	67%
	ACQ.	0%	0%
	OTHER	67%	0%
5.	0-19%	67%	67%
	20-39%	0%	0%
	40-59%	0%	33%
	60-79%	0%	0%
	80-100%	0%	0%
6.	0-19%	67%	67%
	20-39%	0%	0%
	40-59%	0%	0%
	60-79%	0%	33%
	80-100%	0%	0%
7.	C.D.	33%	33%
	CAT.	0%	0%
	ACQ.	33%	33%
	OTHER	67%	0%
8.	YES	0%	67%
	NO	100%	33%
9.	YES	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%
10.	YES	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%
11.	YES	0%	0%
	NO	100%	100%

I.V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Libraries' treatment of monographic series has undergone a considerable transformation since their first appearance in libraries. Monographic series have received even more varied treatment than most types of library materials because, as Jean Decker stated: "Series are something of a Humpty Dumpty sitting on the wall between monographs and serials." (35) Their treatment has partially been dictated by individual libraries' definitions (or lack) of them. Attempts to more specifically define monographic series, such as through LCRIs, can add to the confusion. Rothman and Ditzion wrote in 1940: "If distinctions are made among periodicals, serials, continuations, and government documents, the distinction in and of itself breeds a difficulty inherent in the fact that, regardless of the care with which definitions are prepared, borderline cases must be numerous." (36)

Overall, it appears that numbering monographic series does not greatly enhance the possibility that the series will be placed on standing order. This may be caused by the increasing popularity of approval plans; libraries which have approval plans may be less likely to place monographic series on standing order. It does appear, however, that numbering monographic series will increase the likelihood that the individual monographs will be more extensively cataloged with tracings and analytics, and

therefore will be more accessible to patrons.

For a library's policies to be consistent, the acquisition of series could carry over to the cataloging of series; for example, a cataloging department policy could be, at a minimum, to make series added entries for all series which the acquisitions department has on standing order. In reverse, the cataloging department could communicate to the acquisitions department information regarding books in monographic series which are currently being purchased on an individual basis. If cataloging observes that the library has acquired a large percentage of a numbered series, it could relay that information to acquisitions with a suggestion that the series be placed on standing order.

Another recommendation involves libraries' automation systems. If libraries had systems which did track series title searches, the manner in which they are acquired and cataloged could change. For instance, if a library's system showed a high percentage of patron searches for a certain series title, the library could have a policy to (a) acquire the remainder of the series on standing order and (b) catalog each volume completely with tracings and analytics.

The combination of the various cataloging codes, Library of Congress practices and rule interpretations, internal practices of other libraries, and automation have all affected the

treatment of monographic series in the past and will continue to do so in the future. As Elizabeth Steinhagen wrote:

> We also must live with the fact that nothing in our environment remains static and we are always finding ways to adapt to constant change - not only because we're dealing with serials, but because rules, standards, and systems, whether manual, automated, or mostly mixed at this point in time, are continuously evolving. The first and only constant remains our purpose to make serials and their contents more accessible to library users. (37)

Further study on this topic needs to be conducted to construct a complete representation of the treatment of monographic series in libraries. This study could be repeated for 50 to 100 large academic and public libraries. Research into cataloging procedures should focus on series authority work, added entries, and workflow. Acquisitions procedures should be researched in terms of workflow between monograph and serial acquisitions departments. The goal of this research should be consistent treatment of monographic series by librarians and publishers to ultimately benefit the patron.

APPENDIX A

School of Library and Information Science
(216) 672-2782
Fax 216-672-7965

Kent STATE UNIVERSITY
P. O. Box 5190, Kent, Ohio 44242-0001

The Acquisition and Accessibility of Monographic Series in Ohio Libraries

May 21, 1992

Dear Collection Development Librarian:

Monographic series are among the most challenging types of materials with which librarians work. As a graduate student in the School of Library and Information Science at Kent State University, I am conducting a survey of Collection Development librarians in academic and public libraries in Ohio. The purpose of this research is to determine if, by numbering a monographic series, publishers facilitate the individual monographs' acquisition and retrieval. To elicit the collection development point of view on this topic, I have enclosed a questionnaire which should take you less than 15 minutes to complete. Your responses will be kept anonymous and confidential and you are not required to divulge either your name or the name of your library. The two-digit code found at the top of your questionnaire refers only to the type and size of your library. Please note that participation in the project is voluntary and you may cease participation at any time without penalty.

Please take the time now to complete the questionnaire and return it to me by June 4th in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. If you are interested in receiving the results of this survey, please send your name and address on a separate piece of paper with your completed questionnaire. If you want to know more about this research project, feel free to contact me or my advisor, Dr. Ann Allan, through the School of Library and Information Science at (216) 672-2782. If you have questions about Kent State University's rules for research, please call Dr. Adriaan de Vries at (216) 672-2070.

Thank you for your cooperation with this project.

Sincerely,

Sandra C. Larsen
GRADUATE STUDENT

The Acquisition and Accessibility of Monographic Series in Ohio Libraries

Please take a few moments to complete this questionnaire and return it to Sandra Larsen, Kent State University, School of Library and Information Science, P.O. Box 5190 Kent, OH 44242-0001, in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. To help you complete the questionnaire, the following definition will be used for "monographic series":

> "a group of separate items related to one another by the fact that each item bears, in addition to its own title proper, a collective title applying to the group as a whole. The individual items may or may not be numbered." (AACR2)

1. Are books in numbered monographic series searchable in your library's catalog by series title?

   ___ Yes ___ No

   Comments:

2. Are books in unnumbered monographic series searchable in your library's catalog by series title?

   ___ Yes ___ No

   Comments:

3. Does your library's automation system generate data regarding the number of series title searches performed over a specified period of time?

   ___ Yes ___ No

   If yes, how does your library use these data in regard to monographic series acquisition and accessibility policies?

4. Which department in your library makes decisions about whether to classify monographic series together or separately? (Check all that apply.)

___ Collection Development ___ Cataloging
___ Acquisitions ___ Other_____

5. What is your impression of the percentage of numbered monographic series that are placed on standing order at your library?

___ 80% - 100% ___ 60% - 79% ___ 40% - 59%
___ 20% - 39% ___ 0% - 19%

6. What is your impression of the percentage of unnumbered monographic series that are placed on standing order at your library?

___ 80% - 100% ___ 60% - 79% ___ 40% - 59%
___ 20% - 39% ___ 0% - 19%

7. Which department most often places standing orders? (Check all that apply.)

___ Collection Development ___ Cataloging
___ Acquisitions ___ Other_____

8. As a collection development librarian, do you generally check to see if a monograph in a numbered series is already on standing order before you initiate an order for it?

___ Yes ___ No

9. Does your library have acquisitions policies specific to monographic series?

___ Yes ___ No

If yes, please list these policies.

10. Does your library have cataloging policies specific to monographic series?

___ Yes ___ No

If yes, please list these policies.

11. Does your library use specific definitions for what is a "serial" and "monographic series?"

___ Yes ___ No

If yes, please define these terms.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

ENDNOTES

1. Books in Series: Original, Reprinted, In-Print, and Out-of-Print Books, Published or Distributed in the U.S. in Popular, Scholarly, and Professional Series (New York: R.R. Bowker, 1985).

2. Jean Decker, "AACR2 and Series," Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 3 (nos. 2/3), 59.

3. Ibid.

4. American Library Association, Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd ed. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1988), 662.

5. Doris Hargrett Clack, Authority Control (Chicago: American Library Association, 1990), 37.

6. Mary Dabney Wilson, "Back to the Concept: Perspectives on Series Authorities," Information Technology and Libraries 7 (March 1988), 80.

7. Dorothy Glasby, "Historical Background and Review of Serials Cataloging Rules," Library Resources and Technical Services 34 (no. 1), 84.

8. Wilson, "Back to the Concept," 81.

9. McBride, "Analysis of Monographic Series," 87.

10. Wilson, "Back to the Concept," 81.

11. AACR2, 343.

12. Wilson, "Back to the Concept," 82.

13. AACR2, 563.

14. McBride, "Analysis of Monographic Series," 90.

15. Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, Cataloging Service Bulletin (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1991), 26.

16. AACR2, 249.

17. Thomas Sanders, "Monographs of a Regular Frequency, Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 9 (no. 1), 41.

18. Ibid., 43.

19. Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1989), 1.6 and 21.30L.

20. Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science, 1979 ed., s.v. "Series."

21. Adrian Peasgood, "University Libraries," in Serials Librarianship, ed. Ross Bourne (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Press, 1985), 94.

22. Andrew Osborn, Serial Publications: Their Place and Treatment in Libraries (Chicago: American Library Association, 1973), 3.

23. Ibid., 12.

24. Rose Mary Magrill and John Corbin, Acquisitions Management and Collection Management in Libraries (Chicago: American Library Association, 1989), 195.

25. Dana L. Alessi and Kathleen Goforth, "Standing Orders and Approval Plans: Are They Compatible?" Serials Librarian 13 (Oct./Nov. 1987), 35.

26. Fred Rothman and Sidney Ditzion, "Prevailing Practices in Handling Serials," College and Research Libraries 1 (March 1940), 166.

27. Carolyn Mueller, "Toward Standardization of Bibliographic Records in a Proposed Statewide Library Network," in Library Serials Standards: Development, Implementation, Impact, ed. Nancy Jean Melin (Westport, CT: Meckler Publishing, 1984), 104.

28. Ruth McBride, "Analysis of Monographic Series," Technical Services Quarterly 3 (Fall 1985/Winter 1986), 87.

29. McBride, "Analysis of Monographic Series," 93.

30. Wilson, "Back to the Concept," 82.

31. Lenore Wilkas, "Automated Control of Monogrpahic Series and Interaction Between Acquisitions and Cataloging in an On-Line Environment," The Serials Librarian 13 (nos. 2/3), 159.

32. McBride, "Analysis of Monographic Series," 92.

33. Susan Matson, "Desiderata for a National Series Authority File," Library Resources and Technical Services 26 (Oct./Dec. 1982), 331.

34. State Library of Ohio, Statistics of Ohio Libraries (Columbus, Ohio: State Library of Ohio, 1991), 51, 83..

35. Decker, "AACR2 and Series," 59.

36. Rothman, "Prevailing Practices," 167.

37. Elizabeth Steinhagen, "Monographic Series in a Network Environment," The Serials Librarian 16 (Nos. 1/2), 66.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alessi, Dana L. and Kathleen Goforth. "Standing Orders and Approval Plans: Are They Compatible?" Serials Librarian 13 (Oct./Nov. 1987): 21-41.

American Library Association. Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. 2nd ed. Chicago: American Library Association, 1988.

Books in Series: Original, Reprinted, in-Print, and Out-of-Print Books, Publised or Distributed in the U.S. in Popular, Scholarly, and Professional Series. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1985.

Brown, D. Clara. Serials: Acquisition and Maintenance. Birmingham, Ala.: Ebsco Industries, n.d.

Busha, Charles and Stephen Harter. "Writing the Research Proposal." Chap. in Research Methods in Librarianship. New York: Academic Press, 1980.

Busha, Charles and Stephen Harter. "Survey Research in Librarianship." Chap. in Research Methods in Librarianship. New York: Academic Press, 1980.

Clack, Doris Hargrett. Authority Control. Chicago: American Library Association, 1990.

Decker, Jean. "AACR2 and Series." Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 3 (nos. 2/3): 59-63.

Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science, 1979 ed. S.v. "Series."

Glasby, Dorothy. "Historical Background and Review of Serials Cataloging Rules." Library Resources and Technical Services 34 (no. 1): 81-87.

Herzog, A. Regula and Jerald G. Bachman. "Effects of Questionnaire Length on Response Quality." Public Opinion Quarterly 45: 1981.

Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service. Cataloging Service Bulletin 53: 1991.

Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service. Library of Congress Rule Interpretations. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1989.

Matson, Susan. "Desiderata for a National Series Authority File." Library Resources & Technical Services 26 (Oct./Dec. 1982): 331-344.

Magrill, Rose Mary and John Corbin. Acquisitions Management and Collection Management in Libraries. Chicago: American Library Association, 1989.

McBride, Ruth. "Analysis of Monographic Series." Technical Services Quarterly 3 (Fall 1985/Winter 1986): 85-95.

Mueller, Carolyn. "Toward the Standardization of Bibliographic Records in a Proposed Statewide Network." In Library Serials Standards: Development, Implementation, Impact, ed. Nancy Jean Melin, 99-107. Westport, CT: Meckler Publishing, 1984.

Osborn, Andrew D. Serial Publications: Their Place and Treatment in Libraries. Chicago: American Library Association, 1973.

Ott, Jean. Serials Accessioning Manual. Wasington, D.C.: Serials Record Division, Library of Congress, 1985.

Peasgood, Adrian. "University Libraries." In Serials Librarianship, ed. Ross Bourne, 83-96. London: The Library Association, 1980.

Pinzelik, Barbara. "The Serials Centered Library." Technical Services Quarterly 3 (nos. 1/2): 75-79.

Powell, Ronald R. "Writing the Research Proposal." Chap. in Basic Research Methods for Librarians. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing, 1985.

Rothman, Fred B. and Sidney Ditzion. "Prevailing Practices in Handling Serials." College and Research Libraries 1 (March 1940): 165-169.

Sanders, Thomas. "Monographs of a Regular Frequency." Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 9 (no. 1): 37-57.

Spyers-Duran, Peter and Daniel Gore, eds. Management Problems in Serials Work. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1973.

State Library of Ohio. Statistics of Ohio Libraries: 1991. Columbus, Ohio: State Library of Ohio, 1991.

Steinhagen, Elizabeth. "Monographic Series in a Network Environment." The Serials Librarian 16 (1/2): 65-75.

Stine, Diane, ed. Projects and Procedures for Serials Management. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Pierian Press, 1985.

Walford, A.J. "Bibliographic Sources and Databases." In Serials Librarianship, ed. Ross Bourne, 3-12. London: The Library Association, 1980.

Wilkas, Lenore. "Automated Control of Monographic Series and Interaction Between Acquisitions and Cataloging in an On-Line Environment." The Serials Librarian 13 (nos. 2/3): 159-161.

Williams, James. "Serials Cataloging in 1989." The Serials Librarian 20 (no. 1): 107-123.

Wilson, Mary Dabney. "Back to the Concept: Perspectives on Series Authorities." Information Technology and Libraries 7 (March 1988): 79-83.